UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

What Does the Future Hold for the Children of Working Mothers? - *Ethel S. Beer*

How "Christian" Are Unitarians? - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Humanism: A World Unifying Faith - - - - - - - - *Edwin H. Wilson*

Thy Will Be Done - - *Herbert Sturges*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVII NUMBER 4

Chicago, September-October, 1951

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

R. Darrell Bock: Theological Student, University of Chicago.

Channing M. Briggs: Instructor in Sociology and Group Work, George Williams College, Chicago.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Society of Brooklyn, New York.

C. A. Hawley: Head of the Department of English Literature, Ottawa, Kansas.

Herbert Sturges: Former teacher in the Cibecue Day School, Cibecue, Arizona.

Edwin H. Wilson: Executive Director of the American Humanist Association, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 55

ARTICLES—

What Does the Future Hold for the Children of Working Mothers?—ETHEL S. BEER 56

How "Christian" Are Unitarians?—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 60

Humanism: A World Unifying Faith—EDWIN H. WILSON 62

Thy Will Be Done—HERBERT STURGES 64

POETRY—

Call to Salvation—READ BAIN 66

THE STUDY TABLE—

Existence Precedes Essence—R. DARRELL BOCK 64

Philosophical Giants—CHANNING M. BRIGGS 65

Important New Books—C. A. HAWLEY 66

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 67

THE FIELD—

Released-Time Program—*ACLU Bulletin* 54

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Released-Time Program

New York City's released-time program for religious training was recently upheld in a 3-2 decision by the Appellate Division of the New York Supreme Court. Affirming a ruling by Supreme Court Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna in Brooklyn, the majority opinion of the court held that the Education Law section dealing with the matter "is in no way unconstitutional."

The New York released-time program allows public school children to be excused from regular classes to receive religious training. Students are granted the time—usually one hour a week—at the request of their parents. All instruction takes place outside the school.

The minority opinion of Justices Frank F. Adel and Henry G. Wenzel, Jr., held that the program was "in violation of the Constitutional requirement for separation of church and state . . ." and is "void in that it is integrated with the state's compulsory education system which assists the program of religious instruction carried on by separate religious sects."

Two affiliates of the ACLU earlier filed a brief, prepared by ACLU attorney R. Lawrence Siegel, holding that New York City's program of released time for religious instruction is unconstitutional and "is a clear invasion of the constitutional principle which provides for keeping church and state separate."

Justice DiGiovanna, in the original decision, had stressed that separation of church and state did not mean "freedom from religion" and said that barring of the program would be a "step in the direction of . . . totalitarian and Communistic philosophies . . . wherein atheism and suppression of all religions are preferred to freedom of the individual to seek religious instruction and worship."

—ACLU Bulletin.

[This decision was upheld by the Court of Appeals of New York, but an appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court is planned.—*Editor.*]

UNITY

Volume CXXXVII SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1951 No. 4

EDITORIAL

The world is not coming to an end. The Korean War will be won by the forces of the United Nations. The cold war will be won in Europe by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Western Europe will form some sort of Federation. The Labor Government in England will survive and become stabilized. The United States will become socially progressive rapidly enough to maintain the leadership of the free world. The internal problems of America, such as racial tension, crime, and political corruption, will be brought out into the open, faced squarely and solved intelligently. The level of living that has been reached in the United States will be increasingly approached by other countries. Scientific and technical knowledge will continue to grow. Social knowledge and behavior will catch up with, and surpass, developments in the physical sciences. The McCarthys will wane and the Achesons will triumph. The Rankins will be forgotten and the Bunches will be memorialized. Not Hitler and Stalin, but Churchill and Roosevelt will be honored as great men of our time. Between what now is and what I have indicated will be, there will be struggles and sometimes defeats, but the steady march of mankind will not be stopped by difficulties and setbacks. There is idealism in the soul of man, and there is bone and sinew in his makeup. Evils that were once taken for granted are now a reproach to any people. Things that once could be hidden in dark places are now flashed on screens in the homes of the people. Truth is broadening the circle of freedom, and the light of knowledge is piercing the dark corners of the world. Lift up your heads, all you who work for a better world. There are mighty forces working with you. The sun is rising, the earth is giving forth good fruits, noble men are sitting in high places, and what great souls have dreamed is coming into reality in the life of mankind. No, the world is not coming to an end!

Curtis W. Reese.

What Does the Future Hold for the Children of Working Mothers?

ETHEL S. BEER

During the War the children of working mothers were in the foreground. This was because all hands were needed to keep production at its peak. So to free the mothers to join the industrial army, there had to be provision for their children. Already Day Nurseries existed for this purpose. But they were too few, and the standards were not always sufficiently high. Focusing attention on the problem increased the facilities and on the whole the educational program for the children improved. Only this is not enough. To help the working mother the Day Nursery has to look beyond its own four walls. As a social agency it has a particular function to fulfill. For this reason there must be a compromise between the ideal environment for the child and the needs of this special group. The Day Nursery must face reality in order to best serve the community. Otherwise the future for the children of working mothers is bleak.

By tradition the Day Nursery cares for the children of working mothers. This means full-day care for the babies and pre-school children, at least five days a week all year, luncheon, and after school hours as well as the whole day during vacations for school boys and girls. The aim does not limit the age, which varies in different Day Nurseries and has during the course of time ranged from infancy through the grammar school year. Nor is the type of care defined. Only it stands to reason that a social agency has a moral responsibility to have high standards in accordance with its goal. For children this is very important because human lives are so much shaped by their early experiences. Therefore, every Day Nursery should be as fine a setup as possible and above all offer a wholesome and happy environment.

Undoubtedly there is less purely custodial care in Day Nurseries today than formerly. The educational program is emphasized. But often this is only at the pre-school level. Many Day Nurseries start taking children only at two years or older and do not keep them after five or six. Then what happens to the younger and older children of working mothers? Also, how can Day Nurseries plan a regular Nursery School routine when, to serve their purpose, they must be open ten to twelve hours daily practically all year? The majority of these mothers are on the job eight hours or more, and not all have the same shift. Nor do they usually have a vacation lasting longer than one or two weeks. Admittedly the Day Nursery is not a perfect solution. Only has the working mother anything better to offer? The Day Nursery has to consider existing circumstances. What happens to the child rejected because of age? How is the child looked after outside the Day Nursery? These are important issues.

Take the child under two or three years, so often refused by the Day Nursery now. Granted, this is desirable from the medical and psychological view points. Other things being equal, children should stay at home with their mothers for the first two or even three years. However, there are mothers forced to work, others that prefer to do so for various reasons. Then how about the baby?

Perhaps there are some Day Nurseries willing to accept these young children. Only such a Day Nursery may not be the choice of the mother, or even have the highest standards. In fact, the reverse may be true. And when there are older children in the same family, they may have to go there, too. The following is an illustration.

Mrs. Green had three children, two of pre-school age and one younger, when she applied to a Day Nursery well-known to her. The older child had attended it before, so had the mother's brothers and a sister. Hence her wish to send her children there was quite natural. Unfortunately, the baby was not yet old enough for this Day Nursery. So the Green family had to go elsewhere which did not suit the mother as well. They had to move to be near the second Day Nursery. Besides, Mrs. Green was not pleased with the care the children received.

"One day Evvie hurt her arm and they did nothing about it. Here it would have been attended to immediately," was one of the complaints she made.

True a mother's word cannot always be taken as gospel. Besides, it is understandable that Mrs. Green should trust the Day Nursery with which she had been familiar for years. Attempts, too, are being made to have Day Nurseries more uniform, which may mean that none will take babies, but will this solve the problem? How about relatives and neighbors? This is what another mother did, when in the same predicament.

Mrs. Donata also had three children. The oldest of school age was in the fresh air class. The second was in the pre-school period, but the third was still a baby when the mother applied to a certain Day Nursery. Both of the older children had been there from the time they were about a year. However, since then the Day Nursery, in accordance with the trend, had raised the age of admission. So the baby had to wait until it was approximately two before being accepted. By this time the mother had returned to work, having placed the child with a neighborhood woman. Obviously, this was a dubious arrangement.

Maybe Mrs. Donata should have stayed at home since her husband was earning a reasonable salary and the need was not absolutely urgent. But she had her own way of looking at the matter. Perhaps she wanted to save for the future so that the family could move into a better environment. Or being provident, she may have been thinking of probable emergencies. It must be remembered that these families have little margin. Mothers have their own sets of values. Besides, can their right to earn money be disputed? As another mother under similar circumstances said: "I guess I know my own business best."

Nor can the issue be avoided by saying that children are their parents' responsibility. Society has a share in this, too, since the future of the world depends on the generations growing up. As Day Nurseries exist, they must take into account what their rejections do.

At the present time the New York City newspapers report examples of healthy babies and toddlers in hospital wards. Would not the number be diminished if Day Nurseries were willing to take children under two, at least from a year up?

Certainly it seems unfortunate to separate babies from their mothers during the early impressionable years. Foster home placement can continue indefinitely once it is started. Take the Tessino family. Mrs. Tessino is a widow, living with her mother and two older boys. Both of these attend a Day Nursery. But a third son, a posthumous child, has been in a foster home, practically since birth. Now he is over two. And although the mother often speaks of bringing him home, she has not done so as yet. Can it be that she hesitates because so much time has elapsed that she fears to upset the routine of the present household? Would her decision have been different if the Day Nursery, where the two older boys go, had been willing to accept the baby at a year? Perhaps it is idle to speculate on this theme as even the mother might not be able to explain her own actions. The fact remains, though, that the Day Nursery kept many families together in the past, when it was not so adamant about age. A mother alone, whether widowed, separated from her husband, or unmarried, has a hard time, which the Day Nursery has eased again and again.

To be sure, allowances are given more readily today. These do solve the problem for a number of mothers. But so far they are pitifully inadequate. Nor are all working mothers eligible, since some supplement their husband's salary. Besides, they may be willing to scrimp and lower their standards for a year. But two is a long time. Can a mother able to earn a decent amount be blamed if she grows impatient? Economic privation contributes to marital and family unhappiness. A woman, forced to stay at home against her will, may become a resentful wife and mother. Then disintegration follows as in the next case.

The Bassos were a happy family when the ten-month-old twins, a boy and a girl, first started attending the Day Nursery. The parents were a young and attractive couple, full of enthusiasm. That they were of different religions did not seem to mar their marital bliss. Both worked, but were devoted to the children. Their ambition was to have a house with a yard, where the twins could play. This they were able to realize shortly after coming to the Day Nursery, and they moved away. Apparently, their problem was solved. Unfortunately, however, this was not the end. One day a letter came from the mother. The cousin who had been minding the household, while the parents were away at work, had left. There was no Day Nursery in the vicinity. If the twins could be readmitted to the Day Nursery, they planned on returning to that neighborhood. This was what they did.

All went well until a third child came. Even then there was no hitch for awhile. The mother enjoyed staying home for a change and looked after her little brood contentedly. But as time went on, she missed the money that she had earned. Both she and the youngsters needed clothes. The apartment looked shabby. When the baby was about a year, she reapplied at the Day Nursery. Only by then, the policy had changed and children so young were not accepted. Forced to stay at home against her will, Mrs. Basso became irritable and started squabbling with her husband. The longer she waited, the more resentful she grew. Finally, her patience was spent. The older children came back to the Day Nursery and a relative was paid to look after the baby. But this arrangement was unsatisfactory and did not last long. Then, as the mother still continued to work, the baby was left with the father, who was on the night shift. When he objected and demanded without avail that his wife stay at home, more quarrels ensued. By the time the baby was old enough for the Day Nursery, there was no healing the marital rift. Each parent blamed the other for a lack of responsibility. Consequently the family broke up altogether. Husband and wife were divorced and the children boarded out. What a pathetic ending after such a propitious beginning!

Undoubtedly there were other elements in this situation over which the Day Nursery had no control. Only the fact remains that this family suffered financially and emotionally from the refusal of the Day Nursery to take the baby. Probably this was the last straw and just too much for the couple to bear. Nor did it prevent the wife from working.

In some communities there are foster-day-homes for babies. Perhaps these have advantages because there is less danger of communicable disease and more chance for individual attention. But are they practical in crowded city districts? Besides, how about the foster mother winning the child's affection? She has the time to play with the baby, while the real mother has little. At night both she and the baby are tired. And the baby must be put to bed soon after reaching home. Should a working mother be penalized by having her child weaned from her by another woman? This is not likely to happen in a Day Nursery where there are others to share the care of the nurse.

Obviously, though, if Day Nurseries accept babies, every possible precaution, both medical and psychological, should be taken, Tactfully, too, the mother should be advised to stay at home if she can manage without too much hardship. However, no reproach is due if she refuses, no matter what is the reason. Education is a slow process and cannot be forced. Nor is a discontented mother good for her children. Moreover, is it not inconsistent to blame the humbler mother for working, while the professional woman is lauded for her ability to pursue her career and raise a family?

In regard to the school child, the problem is somewhat different. There is no disputing that boys and girls of this age profit from a group ordinarily. It is a moot question, however, whether the Day Nursery is the place for them. From a practical standpoint the Day Nursery may have reasons for its refusal. Space may be at a premium, particularly if these older children are not allowed to mingle with the younger ones, even outdoors. Nor is it easy to plan a program that includes too large an age range. But important as such factors are, the main issue is the child. Ought a six- or seven-year-old be on its own all day? Is the Day Nursery fulfilling its purpose when it is so limited? What happens to these boys and girls when Day Nurseries close their doors to them?

In the Battista family there were two children. Both had attended the same Day Nursery for years. But when Florence was seven, she was no longer eligible. Therefore, the parents sent her to another Day Nursery, where older children were accepted. There were disadvantages to this arrangement. It meant a change

from the place the child was used to. Besides, as her brother continued to go to the first Day Nursery, the children were separated and the parents had to take them in different directions before work. Perhaps these are minor considerations. Only continuity means a great deal to children in early life. Parents, too, like to depend on the same Day Nursery year after year.

Mrs. Lang was dissatisfied with the settlement to which her older girl was referred. Probably, too, the child sensed it. At any rate, she refused to go, playing on the street after school until it was time to call for her younger sister at the Day Nursery, where she lingered as long as she could. Obviously, this was no solution, and there was danger involved.

"But what can I do?" the mother asked in a worried voice. She knew that she could not deal with the situation and felt cheated by the Day Nursery for letting the child go so young.

Another, a seven-year-old boy, sent out of the Day Nursery, was also left to his own devices. One day a woman living opposite noticed that the curtains in his home were on fire. There was just time to rush to the rescue. Otherwise, Jimmie, who had been fooling with matches, might have caused a real tragedy to himself and the family, not to mention others in the tenement house where he lived.

Nor was Tommy, aged seven, too well provided for after he left the Day Nursery, from the health and supervision angles.

"I give him money to go to a restaurant for lunch. After school he must look after himself," his hard-working mother explained.

To be sure there are schools that provide luncheon in certain districts. But the menu is not always considered suitable by the mothers.

"It's soup, soup, soup," one mother complained. "And this is not enough for active children. So I have to give them a big dinner at night and half the time they won't eat it."

This meant more marketing and cooking for her, not to mention that the expense was greater. Granted that she erred on the nutritional value of the school lunch, soup served too often can be monotonous. To be sure a heavy meal at night was not exactly what the children needed. By then they probably were too tired to enjoy it, which the mother did not realize.

As for the settlements and neighborhood houses, do they have the personal touch of the Day Nursery, even if they can look after the children of working mothers in the afternoon? After all, they are for everybody, not a particular group. One Day Nursery that still keeps children up to ten or eleven makes the following claim:

> The settlement does not keep track of the child sufficiently. There is no careful checking in and out. Nor do they serve the afternoon snack, which our mothers appreciate so much because it makes for a more peaceful supper at night. Otherwise the children come home hungry and cross.

For the younger child there are a number of drawbacks. Their school may be over before the settlement activities start. Also, they may end too soon for working mothers to call for their children. This means that there will not be any direct supervision in a club or class all the time, a rather casual arrangement. Apart from this, the small child is likely to be confused by the larger setup after the intimate atmosphere of the Day Nursery. Already going to school is a new and trying experience. Should the first grader be asked to make another adjustment immediately? The children of working mothers need all the stability they can get. Too many changes are not conducive to this, particularly as so many have upset homes.

While there was a war the plight of these school children was recognized. The so-called doorkey child received a great deal of publicity. This term applied to the boys and girls of this age, left to wander the streets with the key of a house strung around the neck. With mothers so much in demand in industry, these youngsters had to be protected, too. With this in mind, communities established child care centers for primary grade children. How long these will last now that the emergency is over is problematical! Some have already closed their doors, probably due mainly to the fact that Federal funds have ceased and the localities were not ready to take them over. As many more are carried on in the public schools, there is some justification to the objections of the tax-payers. Why should they support this program? Is it democratic to thus single out a special group for preferential treatment under education?

Neither Nursery Schools nor schools for older children with a full-day program are appropriate for the children of working mothers. They need special care. A mother away from her family during the day creates social problems. Such a home has to be supplemented. Outside agencies have to carry responsibilities which would not be the case otherwise. Without going into details, this calls for more than is generally covered by education. Nor can the many hours—usually ten or eleven that the Day Nursery has to be open for its purpose—be justified for all children. Valuable as the socialized experience of group living is, there can be too much of it.

Of course, this applies to Day Nursery children as well. The long day is not ideal for them either, particularly those below two years. But the Day Nursery has to allow for the different work shifts of the mothers and also for travelling back and forth. This may mean that children arrive at 7:30 a.m. or even earlier and stay until around 6 p.m. Not all will remain for the full time, dependent on what arrangement can be made. Only here is the hitch. To put pressure on the working mother to shorten the day for the child can do more harm than good.

For instance, sometimes boys and girls as young as ten years are permitted and even encouraged to take the babies and pre-school children home. As they may stop on their way from school or at about four o'clock, this means that they may have the responsibility for a few hours. Is this not a great deal to wish on such youthful shoulders? As a side issue, is it fair to the older child? Today the eight to twelve-year-old is called at times "the forgotten child" because they receive so little attention. In fact, such neglect is supposed to be one cause of juvenile delinquency. Probably this also applies to teenagers, who do not have enough time for recreation. At any rate, would not an hour or two more in a Day Nursery be preferable to entrusting small children to such immature guardians?

Nor are grandmothers always the proper persons to take charge of their grandchildren. There is a difference in the tempo of the two generations that can be a strain for both. A tired grandmother may be cranky and quite unable to cope with her active grandchildren.

Mrs. Brown is a good example. Each day she calls at the Day Nursery for her daughter's two sons. Because her son-in-law is dead, she lives with the family to help out. Unfortunately, she is old before her time and has trouble with her legs. Consequently, she is always complaining about the boys, even in their presence. Nor does she refrain from nagging and scolding on every occasion. Obviously this is no treatment for lively youngsters. Therefore, to cut the time they are with their grandmother to a minimum, they should be kept in the Day Nursery as long as possible and not hurried home.

Even mothers should not always be blamed when they do not come directly from work. Stopping to market on the way is excusable since they have so little other time. Besides, is it not the lesser of two evils in so far as the child is concerned? Should a weary little boy or girl be dragged from store to store at the end of a day rather than left a bit longer in the Day Nursery?

Perhaps mothers should not work full time since their children are the first consideration. But they cannot always earn enough otherwise. In the last analysis this is for the child, too. Many Day Nursery mothers are the sole support of their families. Some are absolutely alone, making every effort to have both ends meet. It takes a lot to do this these days. It is up to the Day Nursery to help, not to hinder, these brave mothers in their struggle for independence.

The practice of shutting Day Nurseries from two weeks to two months in the summer, which is quite common today, can raise a real problem. The longer the time, the harder it is for the working mother to manage. Either she has to stay at home, which she cannot always afford, or make some plan for them. Even when children are of school age, they should not be left alone all day. The street is a dangerous playground. Perhaps it is possible to arrange for some to go to camp. But this only provides for those over four or five years as a rule. Besides, the stay does not always coincide with the closing of the Day Nursery. Other Day Nurseries that may be open are loath to accept children on a temporary basis. Leaving an older girl or boy in charge has decided disadvantages. Relatives and friends are not always available, provided they are willing to take on the responsibility of other people's children. Therefore, the mother may be desperate and not too wise about what she does.

In one case while a Day Nursery was closed for four weeks, a mother advertised in the newspapers in order to place her three-year-old son. Apparently nothing detrimental occurred to her way of thinking, for she sent him back the following summer. But what a chance she was taking! Undoubtedly she did not realize this.

Another mother had to take her four-year-old daughter to work because the Day Nursery opened a few days after she returned from the country. Obviously this was not a desirable solution. Nor is it probable that the majority of employers would have permitted it.

Considering the circumstances, then, it is better for a Day Nursery to be open all year. If this is impossible because of repairs and cleaning, two weeks should be the most that it is shut. To be sure, a longer period may be preferable from an administrative point of view. Four weeks allow for all staff vacations. This is also claimed to be better for the child because it obviates changes when substitutes are put in. However, staggering staff vacations will keep this at a minimum. Besides, the children are sure to have more drastic changes outside the Day Nursery.

Such problems are not always faced by the Day Nursery, striving for perfect educational programs, centering around the pre-school child. Yet they are important because of the function of the Day Nursery.

To be of maximum service in the future the Day Nursery must do a vital community job. Mothers that are employed need somewhere that they can depend on for years. The Day Nursery confined only to the pre-school period is too limited in scope. Will not the children have more stability if they can continue longer in the same place? In time the Day Nursery is looked on as a second home; it is a tie that supplements but does not supplant that of the family. What an influence it can be in the lives of these boys and girls, many of whom come from unhappy homes, so conducive to maladjustment! There is a great deal of talk about organizing communities to prevent juvenile delinquency. Why not enlist the aid of the Day Nursery? It can and should play a definite role because it starts with the child in the early formative years.

The Day Nursery can be a potent force in society if it does not shun reality. But there cannot be isolation, that is, paying attention only to the activities under its own roof. Each applicant has individual needs, which must be analyzed. The family situation must be known, at least while the child attends the Day Nursery. This has bearing on the behavior of the child as nobody lives in a vacuum. Therefore, other members of the family may have to be helped also. Lastly, the community has its demands which cannot be entirely ignored if the Day Nursery wants to be popular. A good rapport with the neighborhood counts a great deal. Day Nursery staff members should have sympathy for people, and steer those that cannot be helped by them elsewhere. With this in mind, it is obvious that Day Nursery families should not be dropped cold, as soon as the child leaves. Such families often return again and again with younger children. Besides, a follow-up program of some kind is invaluable, not only because of interest but to measure results. What an outstanding contribution to the study of humanity, research in this field would yield! Yet so far the resources have hardly been tapped.

To conclude: Only when the Day Nursery realizes that it is a social agency with the responsibility to provide the maximum security for a special group of children, will it be a strong power in civilization. This calls for a more comprehensive pattern than the Day Nursery has developed to date. The children of the working mothers of today will grow into the citizens of tomorrow. Their care requires the highest professional skill in keeping with the purpose of the Day Nursery. If such a framework is kept constantly in mind the Day Nursery can be of immeasurable assistance in building a better world for future generations.

One World At A Time

A capable man who has something to think about here and now, and who must daily struggle, fight and act, lets the future world take care of itself and is active and useful in this one. —*Goethe.*

How "Christian" Are Unitarians?

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

Are Unitarians Christians? And if they *are* Christians, *how* Christian are they? To these questions non-Unitarians, i.e., members of the orthodox, evangelical, and traditional churches, may have a ready answer something like this: "Unitarians are really so little Christian that they may as well be classified as non-Christian, if not as anti-Christian." Such an answer could easily be read into the refusal of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America to admit the American Unitarian Association to membership, allegedly because Unitarians were not considered sufficiently Christian in the accepted theological sense of that term. And the recently organized National Council of the Churches of Christ in America as well as the World Council of Churches organized in Amsterdam in 1948 may also be said to have judged Unitarians adversely as to their being Christian, since neither of these organizations accept Unitarian churches or groups as members. Speaking, then, for the majority of Christian churches and for the majority of Christian church-members, Unitarians may properly be considered outside the pale of traditional Christianity, and members of Unitarian churches should not refer to themselves as Christians. Where this, nevertheless, is done, and Unitarians blithely assume that they also belong to the world-wide community of Christians, they have, in the opinion of their critics, the obvious duty to explain what they mean by Christian and to determine just how Christian they are.

Speaking for myself as a Unitarian, but not *for* Unitarians, I can honestly say that I do not believe in Jesus Christ, which should read me out of the community of those who commonly call themselves Christians, since the traditional and accepted definition of a Christian is that of one who believes in Jesus, the Christ. On the other hand, I am as honest and free to say that I do most emphatically believe in Jesus, which would seem to permit me reentry into that community of believers which has just so readily expelled me from its fellowship. I firmly believe that the distinction I here make between believing in Jesus Christ and believing in Jesus is a legitimate one and that many, if not most, Unitarians will agree with me when I make this distinction and challenge the judgment of other so-called Christians regarding its implications. It seems highly important to me that in distinguishing between believers in Jesus Christ and believers in Jesus and in discussing the whole question concerning the proper use of the adjective Christian, we bear in mind first of all the original and historic meaning of this term. Now, as even a tyro in the study of New Testament history and in the history of the church should know, the word Christian is an adjective deriving from the proper noun Christ, which is an anglicized form of the Greek word *Christos,* the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew *Meshiach,* for which the English form is Messiah. When in Acts XI:26, we read that "the disciples [of Jesus] were called Christians first in Antioch," we know precisely what this word meant and what it implied, and we further know that, while the meaning of this word may have gained in content and connotations through the later centuries, it has also through these centuries retained its original meaning which is simply that of believers in Jesus as the Messiah. In other words, the disciples of Jesus, to whom reference is here made, were set apart by their neighbors and fellow-Jews from the rest of the Jewish community for one reason only, viz., because they believed that Jesus of Nazareth was the expected Messiah, the promised "annointed One," whom God would send to deliver his people from the yoke of the Romans, from all tyranny and oppression, and who would again establish the kingdom of Israel under the aegis of the Star of David. It was this faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah which more than any other one thing distinguished the new little sect of Jewish enthusiasts from any and all other Jewish sects; and it was their stubborn attachment to this primary article of their faith, viz., the Messiahship of Jesus, which in the days to come caused the estrangement of these dissenters from the synagogue and led to the formation of a distinctive movement which in the course of history has become known as Christianity or the Christian Church. The thing to remember in this connection is this: if at the very beginning of the Christian movement being a Christian meant being a Messianist, i.e., a firm believer in the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, then it must follow by a simple process of deduction that any later religious movement calling itself by this same name, i.e., Christian, would *eo ipse* want to be considered as sharing the belief in Jesus as "the Christ" and participating in those doctrines and rites that the historic church has built around the religion called by the name of Christ. Either the word Christ has by this time lost its original meaning as just set forth, which it most decidedly has not, or it must still be used in its original sense, which is precisely what we must say for its usage by the great majority of Christians, certainly by both branches of the Catholic Church, the Roman and the Eastern Orthodox, as well as by most of the traditional Protestant churches. Any proper definition of the term Christian will therefore have to be determined by its historic sense, no matter how this sense may have been abused or misinterpreted. It is, of course, true that the theologians and teachers of the church have through the ages greatly elaborated and extravagantly interpreted the term and concept of "the Christ," but the church at large has never lost its faith in the original and primitive idea of the Messiah. That it still shares many of the notions concerning the Messiah and the particular functions of his Messiahship can be easily seen and heard in the literature and propaganda of the leading churches of Christendom. To this day, the greater part of the Christian church holds that Jesus will come again as the Christ, i.e., as the Messiah, to establish his kingdom on earth, a kingdom in which all true Christians will form the "true Israel," etc. That this belief of millions of Christians also includes belief in the Trinity and in the Deity of Jesus need hardly be emphasized, and it is only reasonable to add that such beliefs are incompatible with what we know to be historic as well as current Unitarianism.

But is it a fact that the church has through the centuries maintained its faith in the Messiahship of Jesus and that to this day the masses of believers hold this faith and have it preached and interpreted to them? It certainly is a fact, testified to every Sunday by sermon

and rite, and nowhere documented more authentically than in the great ecumenical creeds of the church, the second article of which begins with these sonorous words: ". . . and [I believe] in Jesus *Christ.*" And are not the pages of Christian history eloquent in their affirmation and reaffirmation of this faith in the defense of which thousands of dissenters have been made to suffer torture and death, and countless men and women have been martyrized in *autos-da-fe,* staged by fanatics and bigots *ad majorem Dei gloriam?* Now, if faith in Jesus, the Messiah, has become a *sine qua non* for membership in the Church of Christ, can a Unitarian who refuses to admit either the Deity or Messiahship of Jesus still rightly demand that he be recognized as and called a Christian, and, if he does, how Christian will his alleged Christianity be? I have indicated my own position in this matter, and I believe many a Unitarian will share my reasoning in defense of my position and with me will argue somewhat as follows:

Yes, Unitarians are Christians if thereby you mean members of a movement which originally was organized around the personality of Jesus of Nazareth and in its primitive beginnings surrounded the personality of the Nazarene with the halo and aura of Messianic expectations, seeing in him the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies which at that time were held to be consummated in the very near future. Unitarians are Christians in that they share with the early Christians that admiration of, and adoration for, the Carpenter of Galilee whom the disciples rarely called Christ but much more frequently addressed as "Master" and "teacher." Unitarians are Christians in so far as they share with the Christian movement the great heritage of spiritual truth and ethical idealism which we may sum up under the compound term "the Judaeo-Christian tradition"; they are Christians since they seek to fulfill both "the law and the prophets," even as Jesus did; are dedicated to doing the will of the Father; and aspire to help bring about the reign of the Kingdom of God. Unitarians are most distinctly Christians if that means listening to and treasuring the words of Jesus and seeking to emulate the glorious example of his life in individual conduct and social behavior. If the Christian program seeks to bring peace and good will to earth and to establish among men the reign of justice, righteousness, and peace, then Unitarians are Christians, for precisely this is their program and their dream.

On the other hand, I believe many, if not most, Unitarians would agree with me that Unitarians are *not* Christians if by that we mean believers in those many doctrines and dogmas which orthodox tradition and theology have built around the person, the life, and the message of Jesus. Unitarians, at least most of those that I know, are *not* Christians if being Christian involves belief in those statements of the great creeds which declare that Jesus is "Very God of very God," that he was born of a virgin, that he was conceived by the Holy Spirit, that he rose from the dead, and that he will come again to judge the quick and the dead, and that he will reign forever at the right hand of God, the Father. Unitarians are *not* Christians if a Christian is still expected to regard Jesus as a messiah or even "The Messiah." I am certain that very few, if any, Unitarians still think of Jesus as "the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world," and I seriously doubt that many of them share with their orthodox brethren most of the other traditional beliefs that the centuries have seen grow up around the person and in the name of Jesus of Nazareth. That even in the orthodox sections of the church critical voices remain alive regarding the undue emphasis Christology has received in traditional Christian theology appears from the many very liberal interpretations of ancient doctrines and creeds that appear with encouraging regularity even in the conservative religious press. Thus, for instance, in his recent book, *The Problem of Christ in the Twentieth Century,* the learned Dean of St. Paul's in London, Dr. W. R. Matthews, makes this significant observation:

> The original creed of the Church, it seems, was the simple formula, "Jesus is Lord" . . . In my opinion, that earliest creed should have remained the sole doctrinal test for membership, and the greatest misfortune which followed from the Christological disputes was the substitution of the criterion of acceptance of a set of theological propositions, by which to judge a genuine Christian, for that which Jesus himself laid down for his disciples, "by their fruits ye shall know them."

Dean Matthews here makes a distinction that Unitarians will understand and appreciate, a distinction which gives substance to my previous contention that Unitarians have no quarrel with those that take "Christian" to mean one who accepts the leadership and religion *of* Jesus but only with those who insist that a "Christian" must accept the traditional Christology and theology and the popularly accepted religion *about* Jesus.

There are today many Unitarians who would rather call themselves religious liberals or members of the Church of the Free Mind or the Free Faith or the Free Spirit than Christians, and on the other hand there is a movement of some numerical strength within the American Unitarian Association that identifies itself as the Unitarian Christian Fellowship and states its purpose in these words: "To preserve and strengthen the Christian essence of Unitarianism." However, when in its monthly publication, *The Unitarian Christian,* you read the further elaboration of the Fellowship's concept of "the Christian essence of Unitarianism" you can hardly help asking: "But is this what our orthodox cousins who constitute the great majority of Christian believers would call 'the Christian essence' of historic Christianity?" Whenever I read these sincere statements of the faith of my Unitarian Christian friends and study their noble declarations of purpose and program, I am moved to ask: "But just how Christian are these good Unitarians?" If they really believe that Unitarianism is "Christianity in its simplest and most intelligible form," as one of their statements contends, where does the basic historic concept of the term Christian, i.e., "messianic," enter this definition?

I am and want to be a Christian, if I can honestly and sincerely call myself by that honorable name and yet retain my sense of individual integrity and intellectual independence in judging the doctrinal and dogmatic systems of the church. But if in order to be "a Christian in good standing" I have to submit to what past orthodoxy has said and present-day orthodoxy continues to say about Jesus in terms of an antiquated theology and a hardly less antiquated metaphysics and philosophy, then I shall prefer to relinquish the term Christian and just call myself Unitarian or, even more simply, just a religious liberal.

I feel that in taking this attitude I shall probably be closer to the person and message of Jesus than were even his earliest disciples who obviously were right in seeing in him their "Master," one of the greatest in the glorious succession of saints, seers, and prophets of the past, and who as obviously were wrong in looking upon him as "*The* Messiah."

Give me a renewed understanding and appreciation of him who in his famous parable of the Last Judgment makes the Good Life, not the True Faith, the criterion of high religion, whose immortal words were much less concerned with creeds than with deeds, who once bade a questioner to "go and do likewise," and whose personal faith and religion were quite likely much more effectively summed up by James in his one epistle than by Paul in his more than twelve letters to the churches. This same Jesus so clearly said in his Sermon on the Mount, "not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." This Jesus is the author of those forthright words, "by their fruits ye shall know them," and surely we may assume that he would gladly have subscribed to these famous words of Micah and have adopted them as his personal creed: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God!"

If being a Christian means first of all being a follower and disciple of this Jesus, then I am a Christian; but if there must be a choice between being a follower of the Master and being a Christian in the traditional sense of the word, then I shall choose the former title and glory in it.

Humanism: A World Unifying Faith

EDWIN H. WILSON

In these days of uncertainty, apprehension, and drift, men and women need the assurance of a reasoned faith. They need to believe in themselves. Their minds seek pointers to a future where peace and security are possible. At such a time religious sects come forward, each one saying: "Here is the good news! Here is *the* way to salvation. We have it." There are, of course, many such sects; but we frequently hear them classified as "the three faiths," meaning Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. I am suggesting that there is in the world as a present and potent faith, embraced by vast numbers, yet seldom mentioned—a fourth faith—namely Humanism. This fourth faith—with rare exceptions such as some Universalist or Unitarian Churches, a few independent Humanist Fellowships and the Ethical Societies—has no church to embody it. Most Humanists do not know they are Humanists. They may even give lip service to other faiths; but they live and really believe as Humanists. Humanism is sometimes found within the three faiths, here and there, as a change-producing factor. But Humanism is most usually found outside the churches, active in the life of good men and women who meet their duties as citizens in moral, useful, and creative lives, but who seldom darken the door of a church. These Humanists may not even know they are religious. But they have their ideals. They are tolerant, they love men and life, they live worthily. Theirs is a secular faith.

It is my purpose to state the premises of this fourth faith, Humanism. I represent a group of thinkers who believe that as more people recognize this faith by which they live, as they acknowledge and support it, their Humanism can do its work for humanity better. We believe that this fourth faith can become a world-unifying faith. Many of its ideals were foreshadowed in the prophetic movement in Judaism and Christianity and are inherent in the democratic way of life. It can go far toward uniting the free world on a common way of living.

What are these views?

First: The Humanist lives as if this world were all and enough. He is not other-worldly. He holds that time spent on the contemplation of a possible after-life is time wasted. He fears no hell and seeks no heaven, save that which he and other men create on earth. He willingly accepts the world that exists on this side of the grave as the place for moral struggle and creative living. He seeks the life abundant for his neighbor as for himself. He is content to live one world at a time and let the next life—if such there may be—take care of itself. He need not deny immortality; he simply is not interested. His interests are here. Were he to find himself living a disembodied existence in some other world, he would beat his wraith-like fists on the portals of the here and now in an effort to get back on earth and live.

Second: The Humanist lives as if people count most of all with him. He believes in them. The human individual and his fulfillment is his primary value. He holds, in the classic phrase, that "man is the measure." Just as Jesus declared that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, so the Humanist says that all laws, all customs, all institutions are made for man and not man for them. The worth of laws, governments, churches is discovered in the quality of human life they promote. The goal of "the human enterprise," as Max Otto calls it, is variously spoken of as happiness, as creative living, as service, as the satisfying life, as character, as perfection or self-improvement. It is all these rolled into one which together make for noble human living—the measure of humanity's success on earth.

Third: The Humanist is concerned for *all* men; he believes in human equality. He holds that though individuals differ in ability, there is no master race, no nationality or class which is superior to others. Virtue, intelligence, competence are not, he finds, distributed according to color of skin or hair, or place of birth, or inherited wealth. Not only does the Humanist not push others around, but where any human being is abused he finds it to be his concern. In the Humanist view, no group of people "is inherently qualified to ride herd over any other." Respecting all men, the Humanist does not stir up hatred nor promote the class struggle, but rather he seeks to resolve human problems by the techniques of reconciliation and good will. He is found in the fore-

front of the struggle to end racial prejudice and injustice.

Fourth: Freedom of thought and action is integral and necessary to the Humanist's way of life. Humanism is inherently opposed to all totalitarianisms, whether political or religious—whether Communist, Fascist, or known by any other name—which impose arbitrary authority on individual thought and conduct. Whatever oppresses an individual, restraining and impeding the free use of his mind and making him a means to the needs of a ruling class or an institution rather than an end in himself, the Humanist opposes as "evil." Whatever robs the individual of the free use of his intellect is anti-humanistic. To the Humanist, moreover, rights must be matched with recognized responsibilities because a human individual never exists apart from others, and the good life must always be lived in society. Freedom is won only by the willing cooperation of free men.

Fifth: The Humanist accepts the world view of science and the method by which science discovers truth. The other faiths have lost their hold upon him, because his mind is no longer satisfied with mere assertion. He has a different sense of evidence; he accepts the authority of scientific facts. He is content to wait for answers on ultimates where there is no proof. The evolutionary world view, as revealed to him by science, is not final nor absolute, but it seems to him to offer the truest and the most dependable picture that he can find on which to build a personal life or a new world.

Sixth: The Humanist lives as if he must and can depend on the intelligent cooperation of men of good will to end poverty, war, disease and prejudice. These evils are the real challenge to peace. The Humanist has faith that together men have what it takes to build a decent world. In the hands of true Humanists, science can be made an instrument of human welfare, not the means of man's destruction. "Science for Humanity" is therefore a basic item in his creed. This does not mean that Humanism pictures man as pridefully isolated from his source in nature. He knows that he must study and conform to the laws of nature, use its abundance, work with its power. But man is the active agent who discerns the laws of nature and harnesses the elements to his purposes. Humanism realizes that this must be done on a planetary scale for the salvation of all men under some democratic federation of the world. That is the ultimate goal of Humanism today.

These, then, are the simple premises of Humanism:

1. The Humanist lives here and now.
2. He is more concerned for people than anything else.
3. He believes in the equality of man; discovers no master race.
4. Freedom is necessary to his way of life.
5. He accepts the findings, the method, and the authority of science.
6. He has faith that together men possess the intelligence, the skill, and the will to end war and build security in a free and just world.

Were these simple premises actually made the basis of our emerging world civilization, war would not be necessary or possible. But Humanists—as well as Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—too often give lip service to their principles and fail to live up to them. This contrast between the faith men profess and the faith men live by is universal. As Rome was not built in a day, so any democratic federation of the world will not grow even in a decade. We do not want merely professing Humanists: we seek Humanists who live this faith.

And there is hope. Recently, the American Humanist Association conducted a modest, or admittedly limited, World Humanism Essay Contest. Our word went around the world and from over twenty-five nations came scores of entries. Essays on such topics as "Humanism—A World-Unifying Faith" were returned from Chile, Uruguay, Barbados, and Cuba; from India and Japan; from Holland, France, Germany, Finland, Sweden, England, Italy; from Israel; from West Africa, South Africa, the Gold Coast, Togoland, and Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Many of these essays will be published in the bimonthly magazine that I edit, *The Humanist*. A book may result containing the most publishable ones. Many of these writers see clearly that Humanism, because of its respect for human individuality, is opposed to all authoritarian religion and politics. Many men from many countries reveal the influence of UNESCO. What is most manifest in these essays originating in widely separated spots is that, by and large, so many of these writers, working from a shared knowledge of science and the universal need of men for peace, security, and dignity, arrive by pathways of their own at what is essentially a common faith—Humanism. This is the religion for which John Dewey stands in his book, *The Common Faith*. It is based on the conviction that science used by moral men will be the source of plenty and of freedom.

It is time for those who really live and believe as Humanists to make known their views to one another and to be counted for the cause. It is for that purpose that associations of Humanists already have been formed in various countries—in Holland and England, as well as in America. Last summer, Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, psychiatrist from Chicago and vice president of the American Humanist Association, traveled widely in Europe meeting Humanist leaders in Austria, France, Holland, and England. Other members of our Association made direct personal contact during the past summer with Humanists in such countries as Sweden and Mexico. India also has a Humanist movement. At the annual meetings of the American Humanist Association held in Chicago earlier in the year, it was voted to cooperate with these foreign Humanists in the establishment of an International Humanist Association, whose secretariat will be in Holland and which will hold a World Humanist Conference in 1952. Writes Julian Huxley, the noted biologist and former head of UNESCO, in a recent letter: "I believe that some form of Humanism will be the next important religion. . . . . The lining up of Humanist and Ethical Societies everywhere into some form of Humanist Council or Humanist Association is an essential next step."

Gradually Humanists will awaken to the realization of their common philosophy and their common cause. The Humanist who is aware of his faith believes that time is on the side of his convictions. World democracy is necessary for human survival and can only be realized through the universal respect for man that Humanism requires. The essential thing is that we recapture faith in man and in his ability to establish peace in a free world.

Thy Will Be Done

HERBERT STURGES

The symbol of God the Father of Brother Men is beautifully developed in the Lord's Prayer. The auto-suggestive influence of peace and good will on an individual or group sincerely praying the Lord's Prayer is sure to be beneficial. We can speak highly of this kind of theistic symbolism as presenting a useful challenge to Humanism.

The old cosmology—Heaven and earth, God and man—is left behind. Our values and our methods for their attainment are solely concerned with men on earth. But where in our Humanism do we have the formulas of value appreciation and social-religious activity which match in excellence this masterpiece of theistic expression?

The will for peaceful cooperative human brotherhood must be one of the strong, permanent manifestations of humanistic religion. The good family—husband-father, wife-mother, children-brothers and sisters—is available to our modern religion as a model for societal organization. Universal friendship is a primary goal of all pure religion, of whatever world view. Our task seems to be to formulate and to reformulate from time to time an analysis of existing societal conditions which will clearly and accurately reveal those features of human relationship which are unfriendly; and to produce a science which will suggest social action to correct the disharmonies.

"Give us this day our daily bread" is still a human cry. If we no longer expect supernatural "manna from heaven" or its equivalent, we need to concentrate our thinking and our activity on the problems of scarcity, economic insufficiency, unintelligent economic management; and on the solutions of these problems. By organizing for economic abundance we can lay a foundation for world-wide high living standards, health, welfare, security, and peace.

I say abundance is the foundation. Harmonious, cooperative human living depends on universal freedom from want and the fear of want. Some of the ninety-nine sheep safe in the fold may have doubted the wisdom of the Good Shepherd's decision to seek the one that was lost. He knew that if one could be lost and not found, it could happen to some or all of the others. The world is no richer than the poorest nation. A nation is no richer than its poorest citizen. The world is no better off than the poorest person in the whole world. Theism says: ". . . it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." The fact that imaginary supernatural agencies have failed to realize ideals of universal salvation, including parts which are really important, such as economic security in our life on earth, is no excuse for giving up the ideals. Complete Humanism can make no less demands on itself than the most exacting requirements of theistic religion; and, what is even more important, by changing from supernatural to scientific reasoning and implementation, Humanism has a chance to achieve desirable purposes where theism has failed.

Poverty is the big source of unrest, the great enemy of peace. Scarcity-conflict is a vicious circle, since each "causes" the other. We must attack both aspects of this condition, working for population control, agricultural and industrial sufficiency through technodemocratic world government doing its best to keep the peace while it creates situations of balance between population and productivity everywhere in the world. Neither war nor want can be controlled by efforts directed solely against only one of these evils. Peace depends on prosperity, and prosperity depends on peace.

The ideals of religion cannot be realized by merely preaching them. World-wide human brotherhood can grow only with constructive societal changes which will reduce and finally eliminate poverty and war. Spiritual truth? Spiritual development? Surely we desire all these blessings. Humanism is just as spiritual as theism. We want people to be good, and to have a full spiritual life. To accomplish these purposes we need to dig away at the root causes of human misery and strife. These are the dangerous hazards which undermine spiritual living, defeat religious endeavor, and almost destroy our faith in the brotherhood of man. Scarcity and conflict are the hitherto insurmountable obstacles to the harmonious social experience of universal freedom, security, and opportunity which we ask for when we pray: "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven."

The Study Table

Existence Precedes Essence

KIERKEGAARD: THE MELANCHOLY DANE. *By H. V. Martin. New York: Philosophical Library. 119 pp. $3.00.*

This short book provides an excellent introduction to the philosophy of Kierkegaard as seen from a sympathetic point of view. Dr. Martin is a Protestant Christian who has moved, through the influence of Karl Barth, to a search for religious meaning in the intense and immediate religious philosophy of the Danish theologian, Sören Kierkegaard (1813-1854).

With intentional conciseness, the author has limited himself to a direct exposition of Kierkegaard's work and only briefly touched upon the larger philosophy of "existentialism" which has grown out of it. Much as Greek philosophy flowed out of the cosmology of Thales, so the analysis of Christianity which had its source in Kierkegaard is an application of a philosophical method which has been diverted into many channels by the work of Heidigger, Sartre, Maritain, and others. For the reader only recently come to existential thought, a survey of the lower reaches of this system may be in order before approaching its headwaters in the often difficult writings of Kierkegaard. By so doing, one leaves the way open to profit from Kierkegaard's method without being forced to his particular conclusions regarding the unique character of Christianity.

The domain of existentialism is Man in relation to the human situation—or in Christian existentialism, Man in relation to God. It departs from earlier philos-

ophies by viewing this relationship from a new vantage point. Traditional philosophy considered Man from the point of view of another man who was somehow outside himself and viewing his fellows from a transcendent conceptual realm. In existentialism, on the contrary, the relationship is viewed from within the individual as he is involved in the act of relating. The system rejects as subject matter sets of logical constructs which are necessarily limited by their origin in language, but takes rather the immanent, personal, pre-logical experience of the individual as he sets himself face to face with his human condition or with God. The central character of this vis-à-vis — this "facing-up" — is what Sartre would call the "falling-short of essence," or Kierkegaard, the "original sin." It is the measure to which Man, unlike the beast, is left without fixed imperative in a vast area of possible acts.

At first hand, the falling-short of essence seems a severe and unhappy state of affairs: A man is thrust into his situation without having asked to be there and is stripped of clear sanction or unconditional demand. He is "utterly undone," "forlorn," and yet is forced to act and suffer the anguish of having to choose when no one, save himself, can assert what is a better or worse choice. Having chosen, a man is delivered into the possibility of "despair" because his commitment to his own choice or to God, being completely without reservation, may make demands which seem beyond his strength to fulfill.

When more closely considered, however, it becomes clear that in spite of the torment of the resolve to choose—to meet the "either/or,"—the highest and most intensively satisfying human experience can come in the act of commitment to this choice. It is in this commitment, and never in the license which denies commitment, that a man expresses his unique human attribute —"Freedom." This choice is a man's most pressing concern because in it he defines and asserts his essence —what he is—out of his antecedent existence. For Man existence precedes essence. If a man chooses not to choose, or accepts the ready-made choices of his all-too-solicitous society, he is rejecting his own possibility of determining his being or wasting it in an empty mimicry of social stereotypes.

In the exploration of the character and consequences of this primary choice of essence, existentialism propounds a philosophy of the human act of relating to the human condition or to God as it presents itself in the direct, undifferentiated perception of the individual. Kierkegaard himself draws from this consideration what may be the most influential Protestant Christian philosophy of religion yet systematized. He calls Christians to an unreserved commitment to God which will not allow the easy Protestant compromise of relative commitment to everything—including God. Probably it is a dangerous choice which is asked for, because the professional ministry is inclined always to construe the commitment to God as synonymous with commitment to Church. "Relate to absolute things absolutely," says Kierkegaard, "and to relative things relatively." If Protestant Christianity takes up the existential view of its religion, it must not forget that by its own assertion the Church is relative.

Apparently, there has been as yet no attempt to apply the existential point of view in the context of a Man-centered religion, but the possibility of such a synthesis is genuinely provocative. The work of Sartre, in particular, suggests that in existential philosophy Humanism can supersede its facile identification of religion and ethics and fix its attention on what religion supremely is—the struggle of the individual within himself for an imperative to which he can commit himself absolutely. The relativity and quantitativeness of Humanism is appropriate and proper for the description of the human drama as seen from a conceptual vantage point—but the drama as seen from the point of view of the player is never relative nor quantitative. The essence of the acting is choice, and the player sees his most primary choice of "being" only as qualitative and absolute. Humanism to date does not really account for the individual. Through pursual of the existential method, however, it could perhaps find its origin not in the consideration of social ethics and institutions but in the inward experience of the individual—the ultimate source of all religion.

In passing, it must be pointed out that the role of the Humanistic church in such a philosophical system would not have to do with religion at all, but would set before its members the vast, timeless human situation in which each of them must ultimately cast his choice of being.

As references to the existential literature become more and more frequent, sincere expositions of its source in the work of Kierkegaard become a growing necessity. Dr. Martin has met a part of this need admirably.

R. Darrell Bock.

Philosophical Giants

The Philosophies of F. R. Tennant and John Dewey. *By J. Oliver Buswell, Jr. New York: Philosophical Library.* 500 *pp.* $6.00.

Dr. Buswell, through his Ph.D. dissertation, has attempted to compare or contrast the philosophies of the theologian, Tennant, with the Humanist, Dewey. In so doing, he flays Dewey's ideas of concretion inasmuch as Dewey does not emphasize the individual entity but instead makes his emphasis around the interactive relationships of elements whose discrete characteristics cannot be defined. Buswell explodes over such logical bases and emphasizes that there must be some definition of interacting parts. On the whole, it seems that Buswell leans toward Tennant in his attempt to search for the truth. He criticizes Tennant in the area of his *a priori* position and admits that the bases for Tennant's psychology are rather atomistic. He also points out that the self as Tennant expresses the perception is one related fairly closely to that of Descartes, and of Hume who made the statement that the "I" could not be found among his personal impressions. Dewey, of course, finds the self as it matures and evolves from interacting experience. Buswell, on the other hand, attempts to identify what for him is the truth, which is heavily identified with "fixed" elements.

Dewey, to quote from page 451 in the book, says: "Whatever influences the change of other things is itself changed. The idea of an activity proceeding only in one direction, of an unmoved mover, is the survival of Greek physics but remains to haunt philosophy." The author gets a bit concerned because the empirical method is the *sina qua non* of Dewey's philosophy. He goes on to say, quoting from page 431, that the idea of permanent truth is repugnant to Dewey's system. He also claims that Dewey's entire system is completely disintegrative.

It appears that Dr. Buswell is attempting to move away from the Humanist social philosophy of Dewey toward some theistic base. Unfortunately, the entire effort is rather poorly laid out, as many Ph.D. theses may be, and quotes upon quotes enter pages without adequate integration, without proper priority in sequence, in the whole effort. One feels that minutiae are being played one against the other rather than being aware of two logical giants interlocked in philosophical battle. This mechanical difficulty does not enhance the comparison of the philosophies of these two men. However, there is a good deal of value in the very critical analysis that this author gives to these two philosophies and one cannot help but approve his very scholastic application to the works of Tennant and Dewey.

CHANNING M. BRIGGS.

Important New Books

ATOMS OF THOUGHT. *By George Santayana. New York: Philosophical Library.* 284 *pp.* $5.00.

RUNAWAY STAR. *By Robert A. Hume. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.* 270 *pp.* $3.75.

WILLA CATHER. *By David Daiches. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.* 193 *pp.* $2.75.

THEODORE DREISER. *By F. O. Matthiessen. New York: William Sloane Associates.* 267 *pp.* $3.50.

THE AENEID OF VIRGIL. *By Rolfe Humphries. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.* 381 *pp.* $3.50.

THE GREEKS AND THEIR GODS. *By W. K. C. Guthrie. Boston: The Beacon Press.* 388 *pp.* $3.75.

George Santayana is today internationally recognized as the most influential living philosopher. This volume, long awaited, is an anthology of his teaching, edited by Ira D. Cardiff. Ideas on every subject are here given with a useful index which permits the reader to find quickly the information he needs. This is an indispensable book. Henry Adams, the subject of Professor Hume's excellent book, was, in some ways, strangely like Santayana: scholar, scientist, artist, mystic, philosopher, and prophet. Adams today is just coming into a belated appreciation. This introduction is an absolute necessity. It should be read also in the light of his prophecies about Russia and the United States. Adams saw clearly. Willa Cather today likewise is receiving great acclaim. Professor Daiches' study is the best interpretation of this writer beloved of the Midwest. Willa Cather's work will live as an important part of American literature. Her novels, short stories, and poems are all critically and expertly discussed in this valuable book. It will abundantly reward a careful study. Likewise the recent study of Theodore Dreiser by the late F. O. Matthiessen is the best interpretation of this American writer. There is an element of sadness in realizing that this is the last book of that superb critic, F. O. Matthiessen, whose death occurred while he was at work on his interpretation of Dreiser. A great contrast to Willa Cather, Dreiser yet reveals the making of America. The new translation of Vergil's famous poem will be welcomed by everybody. Vergil has become a part of all literature, and no person can claim to be a scholar in any sense without knowing Vergil. Humphries' translation is easily the best since Dryden's, and surpasses Dryden's for the average reader because it is all in the idiom of today. This book should find a constant place in the Great Books courses. Last, but by no means least, comes Guthrie's really significant work on the Greeks. No literature will ever surpass or outmode that of the Greeks. All college courses in English may well begin with Greek literature, since all literature is saturated with allusions to this the greatest and earliest literature. Commentaries on Greek literature are always in order, and Guthrie's is by all odds one of the best. At the outset the author states his purpose: "the primary aim of this book is to serve as a kind of religious companion to the Greek classics." In this day of comparative religion and comparative literature this book is absolutely essential. Get it, read it, and you will read all literature with an added interest and understanding.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Call to Salvation

Bow not nor whine before imagined gods;
stand straight and free
trusting intelligence;
worship no gods and do not worship man
give honor to creative men
but no servility.

Give thanks for solid gains
from Galley Hill to Palomar:
no flesh of firstlings burning;
no magic-ridden cannibalic feasts;
no witches burning, no fears of hell;
no chattel wives;
no slaves in gyves moaning low;
no sweatshop children;
no deaths for saying Christ was man;
no more miracles . . .
These solid gains endure.

Have hope, have faith.
These goals, not gained as yet,
measure what man would be:
Brotherhood: Ikhnaton and Jesus;
Laotze and the Tao Way;
Gautama and the Eight-fold Path;
"Duty and Service," "Justice and Mercy,"
Confucius and Micah say;
Equality: to learn, to love, to live;
Freedom: to think to speak, to go and come;
Fraternity: to unify mankind.
End War: that Moloch of the beardless boys,
that Juggernaut of babes-in-arms;
end Death: by disease and accident,
needless death at work and play;
end Poverty: distorting, deforming, degenerating;
reclaim mad men:
rotting in wealth they did not make
and cannot count or use,
exploiting earth and human life
for greed and power . . .

These are harsh realities
replacing mythic fears,
the residues of devils dead and gone.

No help from dimming dawn-man deities:
Lift up your eyes to man's intelligence,
to man's emergent love of man—
our hope and help,
our possible salvation.

READ BAIN.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

R. E. COMMITTEE REPORTS

At the Midwest Unitarian Assembly held at Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, in August of 1950, a group of religious educators representing various churches of the Western Conference met with Ernest Kuebler of the American Unitarian Association to discuss needs and problems of local church schools. As a result of this meeting there arose in the Western Conference a Religious Education Committee, composed of five members who came from the major geographical areas of the Conference, and duly constituted by the Western Conference board.

In the first year of its existence the committee contented itself with establishing for itself a firm status in the Conference and in the denomination in two ways: by organizing and conducting a comprehensive religious education program at the 1951 Geneva Assembly, and by issuing during the year three Newsletters.

The committee sees as its function a four-fold purpose:

1. To provide a cohesive bond among church schools of the area and between church schools and the Western Conference Office by the issuing of a Newsletter.
2. To plan the religious education program of the Geneva Assembly.
3. To serve as a clearinghouse via the Newsletter for books, films, records, and other resources in the field of Religious Education.
4. To give original curriculum material developed by local church schools opportunities to be reviewed and exchanged.

On July 1, 1951, after almost a year of existence, the committee met in open meeting. Its composition today includes Mrs. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Chairman, of Rockford, Illinois; Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, Chicago; Dr. William Hugh Headlee and Mrs. Ernest Jones, Indianapolis; Mrs. Charles Wilder, Kansas City; Mrs. F. F. Hughes, Detroit; Mrs. John Ely, Jr., Cedar Rapids; Mrs. C. M. Sauer, Louisville; and Mrs. Richard McCartney, Colon, Michigan.

During the coming year the committee will issue four Newsletters which will be composed wholly of material gathered from the member church schools. It is intended also that sub-regional meetings of religious education persons shall be encouraged by the committee. These meetings will take the form of invitational workshops sponsored by the large churches of the area, which will be responsible for organizing and planning the individual meetings to which other churches in their immediate environs will be invited.

Since the Geneva Assembly was orginally organized as a conference for religious education workers, it is hoped by the committee that that emphasis may be revived, at least to the satisfaction of religious education persons. The committee intends to make the Assembly the focal point of its activity, and to provide through it a program of adequate teacher training as well as a medium for the exchange of experiences.

—Ruth Mendelsohn.

GENEVA COUNCIL MEETS

The Planning Council for the Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly (The Lake Geneva Conference) met in Chicago on Saturday and Sunday, September 22 and 23. One of the first items of business was to elect its officers for the ensuing year. The officers are:

Chairman—Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Illinois.
Dean—Philip Schug, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Secretary and Registrar—Mrs. Bernard Heinrich, Oak Park, Illinois.
Treasurer and Business Manager—Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, Illinois.

A program of intriguing interest, vital inspiration, and useful techniques has been planned. It is too early to make any definite announcement about the program and the leadership personnel. However, as an indication of the high caliber to be expected, arrangements have been completed for Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, minister of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, to give a course on "Our Heritage of Heresy." Those who know Mr. Buehrer also know what a rare treat is in store for all who can hear him speak on this subject.

The genial friend of everybody who has attended Geneva in recent years, Howard Hauze, will be the public relations officer again this year. There is also to be a committee on publicity consisting of Mr. Hauze, Mr. Arnold Ryan, and Mr. Melvin Mather.

Churches, Alliances, Religious Education Committees, and High School groups should begin now to build up their scholarship funds to send representatives to Geneva next summer.

Geneva Dates
June 29—July 5, 1952

CONFERENCE BOARD MEETS

The Board of Directors of the Western Unitarian Conference met in Chicago, Monday, September 24.

Mrs. Harry R. Burns, Cincinnati, Ohio, was elected to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Mrs. Robert L. Turner. Mrs. Turner, formerly of Alton, Illinois, is now living in New Haven, Connecticut.

Mr. Lee M. Burkey was elected to the By-Law Commission to fill the place left vacant by the inability of Mrs. John W. Cyrus to accept appointment.

Appointments of the Executive Committee to the Planning Council for the Geneva Conference (reported in the July-August issue of UNITY) were ratified by the Board.

A general discussion was held concerning the function of the Conference Planning Committee which was approved in principle by the annual meeting and initiated by Board action at its meeting on April 29. It was decided that the committee should determine its own function in the light of the needs it discovered. Several problems considered by the Board were referred to the Planning Committee. These included problems of conflicts in scheduled important events within the Conference, the most effective means of carrying out the United Appeal, boundaries and relationships of sub-regions, and the advisability and need of panels of experts.

Dr. Tracy M. Pullman, who presided at the meeting in the absence of Dr. Reese, reported on the recommendations of the Unitarian-Universalist Commission on Federal Union. Dr. Pullman is chairman of the Commission. There was discussion of the significance of the recommendations and the favorable action taken by the Universalist Church of America at its Conference held in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, in August. No action was taken.

Rev. Kenneth C. Walker summarized the report of

the Commission of Planning and Review of the American Unitarian Association. The report will be presented at the General Conference of the Association at Montreal in October. There was general agreement that the report pointed up weaknesses in the Unitarian structure. There was no clear agreement as to whether the proposal of the Commission would necessarily correct these. In regard to the Commission's report, two votes were taken. One, to recommend that there be a member to represent the regions on the proposed committee to study ways and means for carrying out the resolutions offered should they be passed. Two, to request the committee to make a study of the sources of strength of the Unitarian Movement.

The Board approved the inclusion of any Universalist churches which might care to be members of the Western Unitarian Conference or any of its sub-regions. It also approved a Unitarian church joining a Universalist State Conference should it desire to do so.

SYMPATHY

Our deepest sympathy goes to Mrs. Robert Turner and her two sons, both of whom are in military service, in the death of her husband, Robert Laird Turner, in Alton, Illinois, on May 2, 1951. Mrs. Turner was a member of the Board of the Conference until her resignation, occasioned by her moving to Connecticut.

Sincere sympathy is also expressed to Mr. and Mrs. Herbert E. Clapham in the sudden death of their son, Herbert W. Clapham, September 11, 1951. He also leaves a sister, Mrs. Bernet S. Swanson. Mr. Clapham, the father, is the treasurer of the Western Unitarian Conference.

FROM THE SECRETARY'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

Dr. Charles Lyttle, Conference Historian, has nearly completed the manuscript on the Conference History. I have had an opportunity to read it, a few chapters at a time. It was like reading a continued story where one waits in suspense for the next edition. It is most readable and should have a wide appeal. It will be a magnificent contribution to the Unitarian Movement.

Zoltan Nagy, will be installed as minister of the First Unitarian Church of Alton, Illinois, on October 7. Alfred Henriksen will be installed as minister at Iowa City, Iowa, on November 5. Mr. Nagy began his work in Alton on May 1, Mr. Henriksen in Iowa City on June 1.

The South Bend, Indiana, Unitarian Fellowship has subscribed for, and underwritten, a full-time minister. Rev. Erwin Gaede began his ministry there September 1. It is hoped that the Fellowship will achieve its goal of fifty families before June first. They now have twenty-five families. This is genuine enthusiasm, courage, and the true spirit of extension.

Kansas City has purchased a new property to replace its burned-out church. Various types of building programs and improvements have taken, or are taking, place in Iowa City, Bloomington, Illinois, Madison, Minneapolis, Dayton, Omaha, and Cincinnati (St. John's Church).

The Secretary's daughter, Gaynor, returned home from the hospital on August 9 after nine-and-a-half weeks' continuous stay. She has regained her weight and is in good spirits.

OLSEN HOME FROM EUROPE

Rev. Arthur Olsen preached his first sermon this fall in the Toledo church in an auditorium that had standing room only. These were not just curiosity seekers wondering what a liberal minister would say about the European situation. A large portion of them were the sponsors interested in the report of their ambassador and investigator to foreign shores. The Toledo church and its affiliated organizations decided it would be to their advantage to send their minister to Europe. In the next issue we hope to have this fascinating story of what one church did, why it did it, and what the results are by a member of the Board of the Toledo church and the Board of the Conference.

WHAT HAVE YOU DONE?

Have you ever wondered whether your minister could have a broader outlook, relate more varied experiences, display a wider knowledge of the "practical" world? What have you done to provide him, and thus yourselves, with opportunities to obtain these? Send him to Europe, South America, Mexico. The very least a church should provide is to assure the minister's attendance at the Western Conference Centennial in Cincinnati next May, the May Meetings in Boston, and the Geneva Conference.

CENTENNIAL

The Centennial Program Committee has planned an outstanding series of events for the annual meetings to be held in Cincinnati, May 2-4, 1952. There also will be a pre-meeting of the Western Conference Ministers' Institute. Start planning now to have your minister and a full delegation present for this historic occasion.

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Conference Planning Committee, composed of a representative from each of the sub-regions and sub-regional areas, met in Chicago on September twenty-fifth. It selected as officers: Edward Redman (Michigan Conference), Chairman; Mrs. Gilman Taylor (Minnesota), Assistant Chairman; and Edwin T. Buehrer (Chicago), Secretary. Real progress was made in outlining the philosophy and functions of the committee. The sub-regions and churches will find the committee of increasing help and usefulness. Other members of the committee are Philip Schug (Iowa-Nebraska), Kenneth Walker (Central Illinois), Ellsworth Smith (Ohio Valley), Thaddeus Clark (Conference Board), and Randall Hilton (Executive Secretary).

HONOR ILLINOIS GOVERNOR

The members and friends of the Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois, on the occasion of the re-dedication of their church edifice, took occasion to congratulate one of their members, The Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of Illinois. ". . . for devotion to the citizens of Illinois . . . for achievements in public administration . . . for leadership in formulating legislation . . . for wisdom in ascertaining the public needs . . . for communicating and humanizing the issues of government . . . for unswerving attachment to the liberties of free people. . . . The members and friends of the Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois, offer this citation as evidence of their great esteem. It is presented as evidence of their deep appreciation of the ability to assist people in realizing many of the ideals to which this religious fellowship is devoted."